

Application No. 09/902,963
Response to Office Action of March 23, 2005

REMARKS

In the Office Action of March 23, 2005, claims 1-72 stand rejected. In this response claim 1 has been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. No new subject matter is being added by this response.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER § 102

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,282,417 to Ward (*Ward*).

Ward discloses a method and a system for displaying multiple radio frequencies on a display. In *Ward*, the frequency displayed is the frequency for a given air traffic control (ATC) sector. Since different ATC sectors operate on different radio frequencies, as an aircraft moves from one ATC sector to another ATC sector, the frequency used to contact the ATC changes. In the invention of *Ward*, the aircraft tracks its position using navigation systems such as the global positioning system (GPS) and the very high omni-range system (VOR) and the like. This positional information is used in conjunction with a database and a CPU. The CPU can use the determined position in a database query to find the appropriate frequency to use and display. In another embodiment, expected frequencies are determined from a preplanned route.

A. Claims 1, 10, 19, 24, 25, 31, 39, 58, 70 and 72.

The Examiner asserts that *Ward* discloses all limitations of these claims. However, *Ward* fails to disclose "comparing a decoded radio frequency identifier and one of the stored radio frequency identifiers in the database and for generating a display signal based on the comparison" as is recited in Claim 1, as amended. As discussed previously, *Ward* compares positional information with a database listing positional information on selected radio

Application No. 09/902,963
Response to Office Action of March 23, 2005

frequencies. Nowhere in *Ward* is a comparison made of a decoded radio frequency identifiers with radio frequency identifiers stored in a database. Therefore, for at least this reason, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Similarly, independent claims 10, 19, 25, 31 and 39 all contain limitations similar to claim 1, as amended. For example, claim 10 recites, in part, "a means for comparing a decoded radio frequency identifier and the selected one of the stored radio frequency identifiers." Claim 19, recites, in part "a processor having a first input coupled to receive the output of the decoded radio frequency identifier and a second input coupled to the output of the memory device to receive the selected one of the radio frequency identifiers, the processor operating one or more algorithms for decoding the coded identifier, for coupling the decoded identifier with the selected one of the radio frequency identifiers." Claim 25, recites, in part, "determining a correspondence between the database information and the received radio frequency signal; and generating a signal as a function of the correspondence between the database information and the received radio frequency signal." Claim 31, recites, in part, "receiving a decoded signal, correlating the decoded signal to a known radio navigation station." Claim 39, recites, in part, "comparing a decoded radio frequency identifier and the selected one of the stored radio frequency identifiers; and generating a comparison signal as a function of the comparing the decoded radio frequency identifier and the selected one of the stored radio frequency identifiers." For at least these reasons, claims 10, 19, 25, 31, and 39 are in condition for allowance.

B. Independent claims 59 and 66.

The Examiner asserts that *Ward* discloses all limitation of these claims. Specifically, the Examiner argues that *Ward* shows the decoding of Morse code at column 5, lines 12-14 and column 10, lines 11-23. However, column 5, lines 12-14 simply states that one of the navigational aids, the VOR, transmits its identity using Morse code. *Ward*, at column 10, lines 11-25 states that the CPU can take navigational information from a number of sources and determine a location. Never is it mentioned in those sections or in any other section of *Ward* that the Morse code is decoded by a decoder. Indeed, *Ward* provides no new teachings on the use of the Morse code identifier of the VOR; *Ward* simply states that the VOR uses Morse code.

Considering claim 59, claim 59 recites, in part, "a means for converting a detected Morse radio frequency signal having a coded identifier into an in-phase signal and a quadrature-phase

Application No. 09/902,963
Response to Office Action of March 23, 2005

signal and reducing the sampling frequency to a predetermined level." None of these limitations can be found in *Ward*.

Considering claim 66, claim 66 recites, in part, "converting a detected Morse coded radio frequency signal having an identification string into an in-phase signal and a quadrature-phase signal and reducing the sampling frequency to a predetermined level." None of these limitations can be found in *Ward*.

C. Independent Claim 48.

Applicant can not find a specific rejection of claim 48. Applicant does note that claim 48 recites, in part, "a down-sampler quadrature filter bank coupled to receive a detected Morse radio frequency signal having a coded identifier and structured to convert a received signal into an in-phase signal and a quadrature-phase signal and reduce the sampling frequency to a predetermined level." Claim 48 further recites in part, "a viterbi most-likely sequence estimator coupled to the presence detector and structured to operate a most-likely sequence estimator on outputs of the presence detector." These limitations are not found in *Ward*. Therefore, claim 48 is in condition for allowance.

D. Dependent Claims.

Claims 2-9 depend from allowable claim 1; claims 11-18 depend from allowable claim 10; claims 20-24 depend from allowable claim 19; claims 26-30 depend from allowable claim 25; claims 32-38 depend from allowable claim 31; claims 40-47 depend from allowable claim 39, claims 49-58 depend from allowable claim 48; claims 60-65 depend from allowable claim 59 and claim 67-72 depend from allowable claim 66. For at least this reason, claims 2-9, 11-18, 20-24, 26-30, 32-38, 40-47, 49-58, 60-65 and 67-72 are in condition for allowance.

Application No. 09/902,963
Response to Office Action of March 23, 2005


II. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if it would in any way advance prosecution of this case.

While no other fees are believed due, the applicant hereby requests that any other required fee to maintain pendency of this case, except for the Issue Fee, be charged to Deposit Account 50-2091.

Respectfully submitted,
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: June 17, 2005

By 
Alexander B. Ching
Reg. No. 41,669
(480) 385-5060

Customer No. 29906